United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois

										
Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge			Milton I	. Shadur	Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge					
CASE NUMBER			98 C	R 54	DATE	1/11/	2005			
CASE TITLE			USA vs. Darwin Montana							
мо	TION:	Į	In the following box (a) of the motion being pre-	indicate the party filing the motion, e.g., plaintiff, defendant, 3rd party plaintiff, and (b) state briefly the nature ented.]						
Defendant's motion for reconsideration										
DOCKET ENTRY:										
(1)	Fi	Filed motion of [use listing in "Motion" box above.]								
(2)	□ в	Brief in support of motion due								
(3)	A	Answer brief to motion due Reply to answer brief due								
(4)		Ruling/Hearing on set for at								
(5)	□ St	Status hearing[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on set for at								
(6)	□ Pi	Pretrial conference[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on set for at								
(7)	o n	Trial[set for/re-set for] onat								
(8)	□ [E	[Bench/Jury trial] [Hearing] held/continued to at								
(9)		This case is dismissed [with/without] prejudice and without costs[by/agreement/pursuant to] FRCP4(m) Local Rule 41.1 FRCP41(a)(1) FRCP41(a)(2).								
(10)	(10) In [Other docket entry] Enter Memorandum Order. Montana's motion for reconsideration is denied.									
							1			
(11) 🖪 [For further detail see order attached to the original minute order.]										
	No notices requi	ed, advi	ised in open court.				Document Number			
	No notices required.					number of notices	None of the second			
1	Notices mailed b	-		·		\bigwedge				
Notified counsel by telephone. Docketing to mail notices.						2005	$\{(\Lambda^{i})_{i}\}$			
<u> </u>	Mail AO 450 for		 ·	11.000.101	N1013 1810	All Day				
Copy to judge/magistrate judge.			judge.	7, 900 Yolifi el 3 ,2,u		1/11/2005				
SN			courtroom leputy's	TS:3 NA	SUDS JAN 11	date mailed notice				
		Ì	nitials	Date/time	received in	git4				

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF	AMERICA, Plaintiff,)		
v.)) No.	98 CR 54	DACUE
DARWIN MONTANA,	D. F 4)		DOCKETED Jan 1 1 2005
	Defendant.)		7003

MEMORANDUM ORDER

On December 22, 2004 this Court summarily denied the effort by Darwin Montana ("Montana") to invoke 18 U.S.C.

\$3582(c)(2)("Section 3582(c)(2)") to bootstrap himself into a revision of his sentence based on the Supreme Court's decision in Blakely v. Washington, 124 S.Ct. 2531 (2004), as presumably applicable to the federal sentencing guidelines as well (something that is yet to be seen, because the Supreme Court has not yet decided that issue). Now Montana submits a handwritten Motion for Reconsideration, pointing to a brief statement in United States v. Cabrera-Polo, 376 F.3d 29, 31 (1st Cir. 2004) as supposedly supporting his position.

It is quite true that the always careful Judge Bruce Selya, speaking for the Court of Appeals there, listed as one ground for possible relief under Section 3582(c) that "certain extraordinary and compelling reasons exist that warrant a modification." But because <u>Cabrera-Polo</u> admittedly did not implicate that possibility (376 F.3d at 31), the quoted statement contained no

94

elaboration as to what such "extraordinary and compelling reasons" might involve.

If Montana were correct in his present contention, every pre-Blakely sentence that did not meet the standards stated in that opinion would be vulnerable, irrespective of its age. That would obviously prove too much, for there is nothing in Blakely (which the Supreme Court has not declared to be retroactive) or in the generalized language in Cabrera-Polo that would suggest an opening of the floodgates in a way that would subject the federal courts to a massive and unjustified burden. And this Court is certainly not going to countenance such a result even if it were empowered (as Montana contends) to decree Blakely's retroactivity. Hence Montana's motion for reconsideration is also denied.

Milton I. Shadur

Senior United States District Judge

Date: January 11, 2005